

Application Serial No. 10/562,516  
Reply to Office Action of March 6, 2008

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4639

### REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 6, 2008, the Examiner states that Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-31 are pending and rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

1. Objection to Claim 3 under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claim 3 is objected to for the reasons of record. Applicant has cancelled Claim 3 rendering this objection moot. Such cancellation was made solely in the interest of advancing prosecution and without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to Claim 3.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Masahiro (JP 2003-66206) in view of Cohen (US 4,621,898) for the reasons of record. Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

At the outset, Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-17 rendering rejection of those claims moot. Such cancellations were made solely in the interest of advancing prosecution and without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof.

In establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it must be shown that the prior art references relied upon teach or suggest all the limitations or features of the claims. See *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (C.C.P.A. 1970). With regard to independent Claim 18, it contains the feature of when  $N2/N1=R$ , the relationship held in the angle ( $\theta$ ) formed by the slope portion of the wedge-shaped portion and a normal line of the light beam outgoing plane is  $-0.01 < R \cdot \cos \theta < 0.002$ . By employing this constitution in the view-angle control sheet of certain aspects of the present invention, the ghost image in the screen is lowered and the brightness of the screen image is increased. In contrast, this relationship ( $-0.01 < R \cdot \cos \theta < 0.002$ ) and its effects are not taught or suggested in either of Masahiro or Cohen. As such, these references cannot be properly combined and used to reject independent Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Furthermore, since Claim 18 should be in condition for allowance, all claims depending therefrom are allowable as well. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application Serial No. 10/562,516  
Reply to Office Action of March 6, 2008

PATENT  
Docket: CU-4639

3. Nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 18-19,  
21, 23-28 and 30

Claims 18-19, 21, 23-28 and 30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 12-13 and 15-37 of copending application Serial No. 10/587,551. Please find a terminal disclaimer attached herewith to overcome this rejection.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



June 3, 2008

Date

Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613